

at a given connecting-point, there could be only one answer: the former is preferable and should be conceded. The problem arises, however, when the whole journey lies partly without and partly within the district where existing services are already running to a fixed time-table. The through vehicle is then, on the second part of its journey, running parallel with the inner vehicle. At peak times, when there is a reasonable chance of both vehicles being well patronized, this objection (with an exception we shall note later) does not carry much weight, and the running of both vehicles may be justified; but in the slack parts of the day, when both vehicles would be running nearly empty, and at times one or both quite empty, the point is reached at which the through service is a most wasteful proposition and cannot be continued.

The exception which we noted above to the rule that two reasonably-well-patronized vehicles might be left to run on parallel routes in the inner area claims attention when the city has grown so large at its central area and at its traffic termini that the congestion of its traffic has reached saturation-point. Partly filled vehicles from outlying areas must then become feeder services up to some point short of the highly congested area.

This proposition leads, in our opinion, to a definite conclusion—namely, that a service from beyond a tram terminus should be a through service in the peak hours and for as long as it is a reasonably good economic proposition to run it and parallel vehicles side by side. In the slack hours, when the continuation of the through services would provide the spectacle of parallel vehicles sparsely patronized, the revenue fails to keep within a reasonable distance of the expense of so running, and as a business proposition the outer part of the service must act as a feeder to the inner.

We have, so far, answered in terms of a general proposition. The proposition so stated fits the circumstances of the transport area of Auckland; it is also a statement of the present policy of the Auckland City Council, and, in our opinion, that policy is justified. We find that in the City of Auckland there is not yet the severe congestion at central points which would make it necessary to cut out all outer through services at peak hours.

The feeder service, even in slack hours, is unpopular. People naturally dislike to change vehicles and wait for the connecting vehicle. That dislike would have been present in any circumstances or after any history of development in this or any other city. In the circumstances which we have been called upon to inquire into, the opposition to feeder buses has been intensified by the happenings of 1924–25 and the first half of 1926, when unrestricted competition on the roads led the people to expect and rely on through services even from fairly remote environs of the city. During our period of inspection of the district all of the abandoned bus routes were pointed out to us, and we were taken through districts where we were assured such residents as it contained were demanding a bus service. Such demands, and the demands for through services, in all degrees of unreason, must be faced by any future transport authority of the district.

Should such Services be conducted by Local Bodies or any other Public Management, or by Private Enterprise?

We are of opinion that such service should, as a general principle, be conducted by public management and not by private enterprise. We deem it unnecessary to embark on any consideration of the academic question of public *versus* private ownership; we believe it to be fairly generally conceded, and to be the policy of this country, that where a public utility is of a nature that it should be wholly or substantially a monopoly it should be publicly and not privately owned and operated. We are of opinion that the transport services of the said district should be substantially a monopoly and therefore should be publicly owned.

At the same time, especially in view of the fact that the transport needs of the district end in a fringe rather than a well-defined line, and that services must be introduced that will run partly within and partly without any reasonably defined metropolitan transport area, we think that the owning and controlling authority should, under proper conditions, permit and license private services.